

REMARKS

In the present Office Communication, the Examiner states that "The reply filed on 2/2/06 is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because of the following omission(s) or matter(s): the response fails to point out support in the specification for any new claims added and also fails to provide details as to why any new claims are patentable over the art."

Claims 69-71 were added. As noted on page 10, second paragraph of the reply filed on 2/2/06, "[n]ew claims 70 and 71 generally correspond to allowable claims 12 and 62, respectively. New claims 68 and 69 include features of claims 12 and 62, respectively, in a manner believed to distinguish from the cited art." More specifically, new claims 70 and 71 are independent claims and generally correspond to allowable claims 12 and 62, respectively, including the features of the independent claims and any intervening dependent claims upon which they depend. New claims 68 and 69, however, are dependent claims and include some of the features of claims 12 and 62, respectively, without features of the intervening claims. Therefore, no new subject matter is introduced by claims 68-71. Nevertheless, Applicant notes that support for claims 68-71 may be found in the Specification on page 31, line 13 to page 32, line 7; page 55, lines 1-16; and Figure 19, steps 194, 196, and 198 and the accompanying description.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 70 and 71 are allowable. Also, Applicant submits that because claims 68 and 69 include the features of the independent claims upon which they depend, claims 68 and 69 are patentable over the cited art for at least the reasons given in the reply filed on 2/2/06 on page 10, paragraph 3 to page 11.

In addition, Applicant submits the features of new dependent claims 68 and 69 are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art. For example, claim 68 recites:

“The receiver as recited in claim 1, wherein the engine is further operable to receive a query and use said definition to create at least one mask for use in filtering the received data.”

It is noted that “said definition” refers to the “format definition” recited in claim 1 that is received. In contrast, the cited art (ATSC) discloses a specific description as to how data is to be formatted in order to comply with the ATSC standard. However, as noted in the reply filed on 2/2/06 regarding claim 1, Applicant finds no teaching or suggestion in the cited art of receiving a format definition. Furthermore, Applicant finds no teaching or suggestion in the cited art of “[using] **said definition** to create at least one mask for use in filtering the received data,” as is recited in claim 68. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 68 is patentable over the cited art for at least these reasons. As claim 69 includes features similar to that of claim 68, claim 69 is believed patentably distinguished for similar reasons.

Applicant believes all claims to be in condition for allowance. However, should the examiner believe issues remain which would prevent the present application from proceeding to allowance, the below signed representative requests a phone interview in order to facilitate a more speedy resolution. The representative may be reached at (512) 853-8866.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5266-09300/RDR.

Respectfully submitted,



Rory D. Rankin
Reg. No. 47,884
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin,
Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800

Date: 5/11/06